

# THE GLAD



# TIDINGS

AND OHIO UNIVERSALIST.

Published simultaneously in the Cities of Pittsburgh Pa. and Columbus Ohio

VOL. II. NO. 18.

SATURDAY APRIL 7, 1828.

WHOLE NO. 44.

Sam'l A. Davis, Editor.

E. R. CROCKER, } Corresponding Editors.  
F. HOAG, }  
M. A. CHAPPELL, Corresponding Editor,  
and general Agent.

All communications directed to this office  
must come free of postage.

From the Millennial Harbinger.  
**Theological Discussion.**

No. 14—Mr. Campbell to Mr. Skinner.

BETHANY, Va., December 6th, 1837.

Sir:—Yours of the 13th ult was received here last mail. Your preceeding letter also was received since I last addressed you. I have therefore two letters to answer in this one. I shall briefly attend to the last first.

2. Your letter No. XIII, is little else than a series of accusations, denials, and unsupported assertions. I have never, in any instance, either perverted, or misrepresented you, to my knowledge or belief. You do not need to be perverted or misrepresented. I would not ask, in any opposite, anything more perverted or more vulnerable than your defence of Universalism; it is, in my opinion, the grossest and most suicidal sophistry I ever read. I again reiterate every thing you say I have misrepresented or perverted, and stand to every declaration I have made. I leave our readers to settle those matters. I shall only apprise them of your manner. You did unequivocally admit my syllogisms on the words Paradise, Heaven, Hell, etc.: at the same time saying they were 'wide of the mark.' Now you take these words 'wide of the mark,' etc., and the Baron Swedenburg's correspondences to prove that you did not admit their truth! What a high regard you have for the common sense of our readers! Does not a child know that to say that an allegation is wide of the mark when there is no other objection to it other than its alleged irrelevance or impertinence, is no denial of its truth! You have never made an exception to the truth of those syllogisms. As to their relevancy our readers will decide for themselves.—You have not even attempted to disprove them. I now say you cannot detect in

them the slightest error or irrelevancy.

3. A similar trick is discoverable in your 4th paragraph. There you substitute certain phrases used for the word Gehenna, etc., and say what I asked for these, I asked for the word Gehenna by itself! In the 5th also you make me misrepresent Mr. Balfour. It is you, Sir, that misrepresents my quotation. You substitute my inference from his words, for the words themselves, which I did directly quote from him!

4. This is only surpassed by your foisting two clauses into a dogma (paragraph 7.) to show that I did not quote it fairly or comment on it truly! These you say "are my very words." They are not, pardon me, your "very words," quoted from the 33th page of your Magazine, and do not express the same idea; for you now confess you have inserted two clauses. They are not, however, in my judgement, any better for being mended. To talk about Divine Justice being satisfied with penitence and reformation, is placing it below our legal justice. If a man kill his neighbor, and repent and amend his ways, this satisfies the justice of no human law!!! There is not, Sir, a civilized court in any country that would sustain your doctrine, or say that this reformed wretch "has been punished according to the full demerit of the crime." And this being your only punishment for sin, I re-assert that your dogma makes repentance the only punishment—the only hell.

5. It would seem from the recklessness of your assertions, accusations, and denials, together with the coarseness of your vulgarity as expressed at the close of your seventh paragraph, that you intended to browbeat me off the arena. This may be the best defence of Universalism you can offer; but to get into a passion and rail with you, is not the best exposition of its folly and rueful consequences which I have to offer. If you are the personification of the good sense, logic and courtesy of Universalism, I was in error in not believing those who told me that I would never find a gentlemanly defender of your system.—I shall henceforth, until you mend your manners, address you merely as the cham-

pion of Universalism, without any of the usual compliments of personal respect.

6. There is nothing that demands any special notice till your 18th paragraph.—You make short work of my recapitulation of the acceptation of Gehenna, evading every point or passing it with a mere denial or assertion. It is true that in your 13th paragraph you seem to concede a great deal; but you will doubtless deny it, if I should hold you to it. You say that "the question at issue between us relative to Gehenna, is not whether it signifies future punishment in another state of being, but whether it signifies a place or state of endless misery; and you add, that since your religious opinions were formed (how long since you do not affirm!) you are "a firm believer in the doctrine of future punishment." It is the first I have heard of it, unless you mean by "future punishment" a day or two after the sin is committed.—Where have you, Sir, published to the world that you believe in an *after death* Gehenna punishment, but not of endless duration? Name the book, if you please, or the paper in which I shall find it thus written. You will excuse me for regarding this as deceptions till I see it in print.

7. But you add, "the doctrine of endless misery," (dreadful ideal!) "if true, transforms the Divinity into a fiend! clothes heaven in sackcloth, and fills the universe with sighs and tears. To prove this horrid doctrine, Sir, is the task you have assigned yourself!" What shall we call this!—an anathema, a blasphemy, a flourish, a bugbear, or a Universalian argument!! This, if there be any sense in it, is just as applicable to your future punishment as mine; for if the Deity made his own Son an offering for sin, and yet punishes those whom he pardons only one hundred years in your Gehenna, no mortal can justify his ways. I dare not say what you have said about transforming the Divinity. Forbid it, Heaven! I will quote the Messiah who said that "he that is unjust in little is unjust in much." Of this, however, at another time.

8. Before noticing your new argument, paragraph 18, I should remark on your 15th paragraph, that you seem to have got



an advantage of me in the phrase *present time*. I quoted it, "Shall receive a hundred fold more in the *present life*, and in the world to come eternal life." You glory in this correction. I quoted from memory in a steamboat cabin full of passengers talking round me, having with me a Greek Testament to which I did not always look, for my memory in those matters is generally faithful. And it seems I committed several other errors of which you have convicted me: I mistook or miscounted the proper number of our letters, putting XI, for XII, and X, for IX, etc., etc. Yet, after all, the difference between "a hundred fold more in this present time" and in "this present life," goes but a short way in proving your allegation. But you wish to have it read, "a hundred fold more in the Jewish age, and in the Christian age eternal life!!!" This is too ridiculous for a grave reply.

9. You say that Dr. A. Clark and other critics admit that sometimes *mellon aion* and *outos aion* meant the two dispensations. You might have quoted the New Version also in your favor in that case.—But, Sir, you cannot produce one critic out of your ranks (and I never read of one in them) that ever taught that in these passages it means any thing else than the present life and the future. All your critics quoted are *perverted* if you intended them to favor your ideas on this passage: for not one of them supports your gloss.

10. I come now to the only point in this letter that is new. My 6th argument in proof that Gehenna or Hell can not refer to any temporal punishment in the New Testament acceptance of it, is drawn from the fact that neither Jesus nor his Apostles did at any time threaten temporal, physical, or corporeal punishment to those who disobeyed the Gospel. And how is this very weighty argument met. You prescribe the reading of certain Scriptures concerning the calamities coming out of the Jewish people for their accumulated crimes; the case of Ananias and Sapphira; the chastisement of the Corinthians for abusing the Lord's supper; and Paul's delivering Hymeneus and Philetus to Satan for their contumacy!! And this is the proof that the Lord and his apostles did threaten bodily punishment or temporal sorrows in the Valley of Hinnom or some other place, to those who would not obey the Gospel!!—Not one of these reach within a thousand miles of the point. Temporal punishments and chastisements are very common matters in the divine administration from the days of Cain down to the present time.—But all the intelligent know that temporal rewards, and temporal punishments, temporal blessings and cursings in the basket, store, family, field, and persons of the Jews were the sanctions of that dispensation.—But under the Gospel age there are no such sanctions—not riches, wealth, health, nor prosperity for obeying; not poverty, sickness, or temporal calamities for diso-

beying the Gospel. Christ's sanctions are, "He that believeth not shall be condemned"—not cursed with blasting, mildew, or locusts, or the Valley of Hinnom—They that "obey not the Gospel shall be punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord!"—not with the loss of health, wealth, goods, or chattels. Behold, you despisers, and wonder and perish," was Paul's finale—"Be converted that your sins may be blotted out," was Peter's argument. In no case was any temporal inducement or threatening urged as a reason of obeying the Gospel. I will only add, that your evading the antithesis of "entering into life and being cast into hell, into the everlasting fire," leaves on record against you one of the most immutable and general laws of language—viz. the words on both sides of an antithesis are taken in the same extent of meaning.—From all which, I ask, may we not conclude, that my six arguments in proof that Gehenna, in its New Testament associations, and antithesis with future bliss and eternal life, does most certainly and unanswerably mean future and everlasting punishment, all remain in pristine vigor; you having now assailed formally only one of them, and that evidently without perceiving the point of it! So endeth the first proposition.

11. Your letter No. XI. (miscalled No. X.) is upon *aion* and *aionios*. Your first assumption, paragraph 6, on this subject, is that *aionn* compounded of *aei*, always, and *oon*, being, can not mean endless duration, because that *oon* by itself signifies not duration, but being; and *aei* signifies not "endlessly," but "continuity"! You quote eight places (paragraph 7) where *aei* occurs in the New Testament, and I appeal to the reader whether *aei* does not in every one of them mean duration endless as the subject with which it is connected.—"You do always (*aei*) resist the Holy Spirit;" "always rejoicing;" "They do always err;" "Be always ready," etc., etc. The Scotch or English word *aye*, always, is this word *aei* anglicised. Now if there be any word that necessarily and essentially represents endless duration, it is the word *aion*, always being.

12. You say you find *aion* the substantive 127 times, while I count it only 103 times in the New Testament. I count the phrases where it occurs—you count the word, although it should occur twice in one clause of a sentence. This explains the difference. Five of your 128 are spurious, but for this I care not. You add, "It is translated by the word 'ever' 71 times and by the word 'never' 7 times." This is a mistake: *aion* is never translated *never*. There is a negative particle with it.—You ought to have said, it is translated in the New Testament 78 times ever, three times evermore, twice eternal, and world without end once—84 times equivalent to eternal; and world 36 times, worlds twice, ages twice, course once, and left untrans-

lated twice." Very particular indeed! Mind, then, it is never translated once a limited time, or a part of any given duration; but on all occasions extends to the full limits of the subject.

13. You also say you count *aionios* seventy-one times, and that it is translated "eternal" forty-two times, "everlasting" twenty-five times, "ever" once, and "world" three times. I have not time to contest your enumeration; it is sufficiently accurate for my purpose—only that it is never, by itself, translated world. "Before the world was," *pro chronon aionion*, is from eternity.

14. But, Sir, your manœuvre [paragraph 8] in substituting eternity or eternities for *aion*, is too preposterous for a school-boy. Certainly you intended that for your special friends, who know as much of criticism as of the philosopher's stone. But now, with your own data as to the number of occurrences and the common version of them, I have to submit a few facts and reasonings. And first of *AI-oon*—

15. This word occurs, you say, 127 times. Now of these referring to God, or Christ, to his own being, perfections, and praises, we have it rendered 36 times "forever" or "forever and ever," such as Rev. x: 6—"Swear by him that liveth forever and ever." Rom. ix: 5—"God over all blessed forever." xi: 36—"To whom be glory forever." Rev. i: 18—"Behold I live forever and ever." I formerly noted these at 22, because in 15 of these phrases the word occurs twice; but on your count I now put them down 36. Now, Sir, if in this case this word does not denote endless duration, no word can do it, or rather, there is no such thing!

But in reference to the future state of the righteous, we have this same phrase or word translated forever and ever in the following instances: John vi: 51—"If any one eat of this bread he shall live forever." viii: 51—"If any one keep my word he shall never see death." x: 28—"They shall never perish." "He that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John ii: 17, vi: 58; viii: 52; xi: 26; 2 Cor. ix: 9; Rev. xxii: 5. Of this sort there are ten occurrences. Besides these, it is translated 38 times "ever" "forever" and "forever and ever"—making in all 84 times.

17. In reference to the punishment of the wicked, it occurs eight times in five passages—2 Peter. "To whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Jude; ver. 13; Rev. xiv: 11; xiv: 13; xxi: 10. "And they shall be tormented continually, forever and ever," or, as you say, for eternities of eternities.

18. Now, waiving the figurative uses of this word, we have got it thirty-six times applied to God and Christ, to their glory and praise; ten times to the future state of the righteous, and eight times to the future state of the wicked. I ask, then, by what rule or law of language—what canon



of criticism, or for what reason do you conclude that when it is applied to God, to his perfections, to his praise, to the righteous portion of our race in the future state, it should always signify endless, forever and ever, in the most unlimited sense; and not have the same signification when applied to the future state of the wicked, but always in their case mean ending or for a limited time!! I put this question with the utmost confidence that it never can be, because it never was, satisfactorily answered by any Universalist.

19. But I have not half done with *aioon* yet. I have lying before me the Septuagint version of the Old Testament and the Hebrew Bible itself, and proceed to state a few facts for which I hold myself responsible:—

1st. We find *olem* or *oulm*, in some of its variations, more than three hundred, say three hundred and ten times, in the Hebrew Old Testament. In all these instances, with comparatively a very few exceptions, it is used to express unlimited time or a period without end.

2. I find also that in the Septuagint *aioon* in some of its flexions, is found more than 320 times, from 320 to 328. In more than three hundred of these it represents the Hebrew *oulm*, and as yourself admit, it fairly represents it.

3d. I was about to state that this word, as well as *aioonios*, frequently occurs in the Apocryphal books; but by an interpretation of our rules of discussion, which I never contemplated, even in criticism you preclude these writings! Be it so, then. I argue nothing from this fact.

4th. Of some 18 or 20 cases at most, in which the word *aioon* in the Septuagint represents any other word than *oulm*, it is a word or a phrase which is synonymous with *oulm*, or where the Septuagint differs from the common Hebrew text. Now be it observed, that there is no word of such frequent occurrence in the sacred dialect of more definite, or less figurative, or of more ascertainable import, than *aioon*.

5th. For of the 320 times in which it is found in the Old Testament, it is translated "ever," "forever," and "forever and ever," and "evermore," about 290 times!—Even in the Psalms of David we have it more than eighty times in such acceptations as, "The Lord shall endure forever." ix: 7.—"Thou hast made him most blessed forever." xxi: 6.—"The Lord is king forever." xxix: 10.—"Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." xiv: 6, etc. etc.—"All the workers of iniquity shall be destroyed forever and ever." ix: 2, 7.—"His saints are preserved forever." xxxvii: 28.—"The Lord knoweth the paths of the upright, and their inheritance shall be forever." xxxvii: 18. I might greatly multiply these; for if I were to take your way of counting the word in all the phrases in which it occurs, I know not but I should be able to add a hundred more such occurrences in the Old Testament.

20. To all this it will be expected, no doubt, that this word in the Old Testament as in the New, is used characteristically, and in a part of its signification applied to hills, mountains, covenants, priesthood, the land of Judea, etc.—Grant it, for this is common to all words in every language.—We use the word eternal, endless, forever, in the same characteristic style every day: "You everlasting talker." "He is an endless declaimer." "She is a perpetual tattler." "He is an endless trouble to me."—"He is forever seeking his own honor." I could fill pages of such common phrases. And would you not say that he who thence infers that this is the true and proper use of the word, and that we mean no more by it when we talk of God's existence, of heaven, of future happiness, is, to say the least of him, no very profound linguist and logician—we only add, and of future misery too!

21. To proceed in the same inductive style with *aioonios*: All the learned know, and many of the unlearned have heard, that from *aioon*, always being, eternity, forever, comes *aioonios*, eternally, everlasting. We have the word eternity only once in the common version, Is. lviii: 15.—"The Holy One who inhabited eternity."—Here it is *aioon* in the Septuagint. They might, indeed, have rendered the same sort of phrase (Micah v: 12) by the same word; for it is not only *olem* in the Hebrew, but *aioon* in the Septuagint: "Whose goings forth have been of old from everlasting"—literally from the days of eternity."

22. You have conceded enough for me on *aioonios*. You say, out of the seventy-one times in which you find it (some of which are, by the way, spurious readings) in the New Testament, it is in the common version forty-two times translated eternal and twenty-five everlasting, and once ever, leaving but three occurrences to dispute about. I venture to say you cannot find another adjective of the same construction in the whole New Testament that is so uniformly rendered by one word in all languages, as this is by the strongest word of endless duration. To confirm this I will only add that I find it more than ninety times in the Septuagint of the Old Testament, and only seven times representing any other word than *olem* in some of its forms! in English rendered as in the New Testament, by eternal, everlasting, forever.

23. What need have we, then, for farther witness? Look first at the general fact: the words *aioon*, *aioonios*, occur in the Greek Old and New Testament some six hundred and eighteen times, of which extraordinary sum they are properly and literally translated in the common version five hundred and eight times by the strongest terms in human speech indicative of endless duration, such as 'eternal,' 'everlasting,' 'forever,' and in the judgment of the most numerous and learned critics, might as well in many of the others have

been as literally translated by the same words. Then look, in the second place, at the special fact. These said terms occur in the New Testament alone, referring to the continuance of the happiness of the righteous, sixty-one times; and to the continuance of the punishment of the wicked fifteen times, translated 'eternal,' 'everlasting,' 'forever.' Now from the general fact, and this still more striking special fact, I emphatically, and with intense interest, demand why—for what reason—by what law of language or canon of criticism, shall the duration of the happiness of the righteous and of the misery of the wicked be as different as time and eternity, when they are thus so often, and in such various circumstances, set forth by the very same words! On the answer to this question must always hang the fate of Universalism, so far as the meaning of these words is concerned. I hope, then, this question will not be again shurred over, but be clearly, fully, and rationally met and answered.

24. A specimen or two of the puerile evasions of their force, as a warning against similar manœuvring in future, will now be selected from your letter of September 22, paragraph 9. After your array of the figurative use of the word *aioon*, age, or world, under the literal representative of it, eternity, you make the following grave objections:—because we have the plural of these words used for the singular, and the plural twice repeated, as *tous aionous toon aionoon*, used as the most intensive form of the word; you say, "this is a circumstance sufficient to prove that the word does not of itself, radically, legitimately, or properly imply endless duration." A profound objection, truly! A new law of criticism! A single glance into the Hebrew style, into the Bible language, will thoroughly scatter this mist. But I wish all our readers to understand your learned objection, and shall state it again in more familiar style. Because we have the phrases "ages of ages," "eternity of eternities," "forever and ever," to represent endless duration, therefore in the singular number, and without repetition, the words "age," "eternity," "forever," cannot mean the same thing; but must mean less in the singular than in the plural, and less when once than when twice used in the same phrase. A few examples of Hebrew or Biblical usage will settle this point. If our readers understand Hebrew, I would request them to read Ps. xvii: 6, 7, 8. lxi: 5. cxlv: 13. Isaiah, xlv: 15. 2 Chron. vi: 2, where they will find *olem* in the plural, signifying just what *olem* in the singular means. I would tell them to examine the word of God, wisdom, dwelling, the wicked, Creator, etc. in the Hebrew, and see whether in the singular and plural forms in which they are frequently found, they have a different signification. Or if they understood Greek, I would refer them to *Sabbaton* and *Sabbata*, to *ouranos ou-*



*ranol*, the singular and plural of Sabbath and Heaven, so frequent in the New Testament, which mean the same in both numbers. But as they do not all read these, I will only invite them to examine in the common version such phrases as "the holy of holies," "a servant of servants," "the heaven of heavens," etc., to see whether this intensive form of expression made the words holy, heaven, servant in the singular to mean something less than holy, heaven, servant scripturally etymologically, and properly! But if the plural form or repetition changes the meaning of words, we are still sustained in the question in debate, if not in behalf of the righteous, at least as respects the wicked; for we are told that "the smoke of their torment ascendeth forever and ever," and "all the workers of iniquity shall be destroyed forever and ever!!" for ages of ages, for eternities of eternities; and if this expresses not duration without end, language can never express an idea certainly and unequivocally.

25. To sum up this branch of the argument: We have from your own display of *aei*, always and *eon*, being, shown that no word etymologically or radically, can more naturally signify endless being or endless duration. 2. That *EVER FOREVER, EVER-MORE, and ETERNAL*, are its most common versions in both Testaments. You have examined the New, and conceded this. I have examined both the Old and New, and if it is disputed I will reinforce it; but I think you will not demand this. 3. When applied to God's being, you admit it means endless. 4. Also, when applied to his glory, it means duration without end. 5. *Al-<sup>so</sup>*, when applied to the praises to be offered to him. And, 6, you also admit that when it is applied to the future happiness of the righteous, it means endless. Now for your reasons why it signifies a limited time, an ending period when expressive of the continuance of the punishment of the wicked.

26. Our readers will doubtless remember that we told them long since that the English Bible enables any honest person of common sense to settle this matter as satisfactorily to himself as though he possessed the most perfect knowledge of Hebrew, Greek and Latin—because, although the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans believed and taught future and eternal punishment, their words like our own "eternal," "everlasting," "forever," etc. were used sometimes figuratively, in reference to present things\*—just as the most sacred words, God, Lord, Savior, Redeemer, etc. etc. are with us. There is not, then, a single atom of relevance or propriety in all this Universalian talking about *ORHENNA, HADES, AIKON, AIKONIOS*, etc. It is all fog to the eyes of their readers. But as they choose this untoward way, we shall give them messages of it to satiety.

27. My last letter written on the Ohio, fell short of the stipulated length about one page. I am some words, if not arguments

behind, if my compositor rightly informs me. Meanwhile, sir, be assured that I will henceforth omit to notice any paragraph you write, in which there is an expression so grossly vulgar, undignified, and coarse, as in some paragraphs of your last communication. I shall set down such uncourteousness as an indication of your conscious want of argument. I have found some decent and veritable gentlemen among the Universalian laity; but such folks among their clergy are rare commodities.

28. Unless you can forward your replies in manuscript before you send them to Utica, it will be impossible, I judge, to receive them here in time for a monthly exchange.

A. CAMPBELL.

\*I never saw a patent from an American Land Office that did not end with these words: "His heirs and assigns forever." Does this prove that Americans have no other "forever" than such as a Deed or Patent conveys?"

## THE GLAD TIDINGS.

S. A. DAVIS, Editor.

PITTSBURGH, APRIL, 7, 1838.

### LOOK AT THIS!!!

The editor of the Conference Journal, the Methodist paper of this city, has shown himself to be a spiritual coward, and virtually admitted that the sentiments he advocates are false. Illustration.—In the Journal of the 22nd of March, he has published an article purporting to be original, headed, 'Moral Tendency of Universalism,' in which the writer shows either his entire ignorance of Universalism, or his utter disregard for truth. He commences as follows:

"By man's apostasy, error has been introduced into the world, and both reason and moral obligation call upon us to counteract its destructive influence. Error extinguishes or obscures the lamp of truth, and causes us to lose our way, and stumble in the dark. It wraps itself in the folds of sophistry, and shuns the light; lest its deformity be discovered. Not so with truth.—Truth needs no mask, no sophistry, for its support. It stands forth to the view of all, in its own native form and loveliness, and does not fear even the scrutinizing eye of criticism."

After perusing the article, we addressed the editor the following note:

Pittsburgh, March 26, 1838.

Rev. Sir.—I notice in the Journal of the 2nd inst. an article headed 'Moral Tendency of Universalism.' The object of this note, Sir, is to request that you will publish a respectful reply to the said article from me. If so, I will copy both the article and reply into the Glad Tidings. Please to inform me by the bearer whether you will comply with my request or not, and oblige,

Yours respectfully, S. A. DAVIS.

Rev. W. Hunter.

N. B.—The writer of the article says, that "error wraps itself in the folds of sophistry, and shuns the light," &c. "But not so with truth—it needs no mask, it stands forth to the view of all," &c.

By your compliance or non-compliance

with the above request, will show to the public, on the writer's own ground, which of us have the truth. D.

The note was returned by the bearer, Pr. H. Torrey, with a verbal answer that he could not comply with the request. Now, candid reader! what think you of this matter? Does the Rev. Wm. Hunter, editor of the Pittsburgh Conference Journal, believe there is truth in that article? Does he believe Universalism is an error? He cannot believe both, for that article declares "error shuns the light, lest its deformity be discovered" while truth "stands forth to the view of all, in its own native form and loveliness, and does not fear even the scrutinizing eye of criticism." The position here laid down is a good one—it is true. Now let us make the application—let us try by this test the doctrines of Methodism and Universalism. The Methodists have established their own test—will they abide by it? We will see. "Error extinguishes or obscures the lamp of truth"—so does Mr. Hunter, by refusing to publish my reply to his readers, and thus preventing the aforesaid article from going before the readers of the Glad Tidings. "Error causes us to lose our way, and stumble in the dark." Example.—The author of the said article, is entirely lost to candor, truth, and I had almost said, moral honesty—he is morally speaking, in the darkness of night, and has stumbled into the pit of error, in attempting to oppose Universalism when he evidently knows nothing about it.

Again.—"It (error) shuns the light, lest its deformity be discovered." How true. Mr. Hunter has given a practical illustration of this fact. He has been invited to open his columns to an investigation, but refuses—he can publish one side—he dares to tell his own story, but he "shuns the light of investigation, lest the deformity of his doctrine should be discovered." He dare not publish both sides—he dare not have the errors and absurdities of that article pointed out to his readers. Now let him prove that he possesses sufficient moral courage to do it, by publishing a reply, and I will then acknowledge that I was wrong. If he does not do it, the community will judge which is truth and which is error. "Not so with truth—it stands forth to the view of all—and does not fear even the scrutinizing eye of criticism." Neither does Universalism—it covets the light, and courts investigation. The columns of its periodicals are open to all, and its preachers are ever ready to give a reason for the hope that is in them. But how is it with Methodism? It shuns the light, lest its deformity be discovered. This cannot be denied now, for we have seen it practically demonstrated. But look again. Truth appears "in its own native form and loveliness." Then the doctrine of endless hell torments cannot be true, for who, or what, can discover any "loveliness" in that sentiment? I doubt whether the old adversary himself, the king of the infernal pit, with all his opposition to universal salvation, is so destitute of good taste as to say that endless damnation appears *lovely*. Then Methodism is not the truth, according to our writers reasoning. It is not my intention to reply to the article



for it is entirely unworthy of the least notice, being a headless, pointless, senseless thing, as it regards argument against Universalism. It does not touch the subject at all. The writer has built up a man of straw and christened it Universalism, and it will doubtless afford some satisfaction to his brethren, to see him tear it to pieces. My object in making the request, was simply to correct the error into which the writer has fallen. But that I am not permitted to do. What shall we say of the man who will publish to the world that which is not true, and then refuse those who are effected by it, the privilege of answering for themselves? Does the spirit of Christianity dictate such a course. Does truth dictate it? Is it honorable? No, far from it. Don't attempt to calm your conscience, Mr. Hunter, by saying we are beneath your notice—that you have a right to say what articles shall appear in your paper and what shall not. That will not do, for you have noticed us by publishing that article. And as to the latter, you have no right, morally speaking, to admit an article reflecting upon an individual or a body of people, without granting them the privilege to answer for themselves.

This affair shows that Mr. Hunter is afraid to come into the light—that he doubts the truth of his own system, and knows it cannot be supported by candid investigation. D.

#### THE DIFFICULTY.

Br. Whittemore, of the Trumpet, says, "that was a good hint to the Agents and subscribers of the Glad Tidings, in the No. of March 10th. We hope it will be available." Thank you, Br. W——, we hoped so too—but alas! it has entirely failed. An esteemed brother in the ministry, has, recently sent us particular word, not to 'dun' so much. We thank him also.—But what shall we do? One says we are right, another says we are wrong. To please all we cannot—here is the difficulty. We dislike to dun as much as we dislike to be *dunned*. The great difficulty is this—those who pay punctually and need no dunning, are the ones who complain because we dun so much, while those who are negligent, some of whom *never* pay, seem well satisfied to be *dunned* and *billed*, month after month, and year after year. I would that I could provoke the latter class to jealousy, to love and good works.

The truth is this, those who have paid punctually, cannot feel guilty—the coat will not fit them, and they should not attempt to wear it, and thus deprive the proper owners of the use of it. We know the times are hard and money is scarce, and many of our best patrons are troubled to obtain it. But will they not think, that if it be troublesome for them individually to raise from \$1.50 to \$3.00 it is vastly more troublesome for us to raise many hundreds? We have one thousand dollars owing to us on the first and second volumes. We do not expect, or ask for it all at once, but we do want, and have reason to expect enough each week to buy our marketing, to pay for our paper and printing.—We have said this much by way of apology, if apology be necessary. D.

#### CONTROVERSIAL.

Perhaps we ought to apologize to our readers for taking up so much of the present number of our paper in articles of a controversial nature. We have just received a gentle hint upon this subject, from a friend in Ohio—he thinks we ought to make our paper more practical.—We thank our friend for his candid advice—we are always willing to receive the advice of friends in the spirit of love.

We know controversy is not so profitable to those who are already believers, but our paper is a pioneer—it goes to many who are not yet convinced of the truth. The controversial articles are read by hundreds in this city alone, and doubtless many in other places, who would not read the papers at all, did we adopt the opposite course. Hence we believe we should labor for the greater good. It is true, we have not so great a variety as we could wish—we should like to be able to satisfy the wants of all. We are happy to inform our patrons that we shall remedy this evil, if it be one, soon by publishing the paper every week, which will enable us to publish as much controversy as we do now, and more than three times as much on practical subjects, and all this too at the same price. Will our friends think of this, and help us. By the middle of May we shall commence—arrangements are now making—no mistake. D.

#### THEOLOGICAL CHART.

We would call the attention of the readers, to a notice in our last No., headed, Mulum in Parvo. The work is now completed and ready for delivery. Br Chappell has succeeded in bringing much that is useful and interesting, into very small compass, and now offers the information, which would otherwise cost dollars and much hard labor, for a small sum. The work is intended to be issued every year as an annual Register, hence they can be sent to any part of the United States by mail, at the same as newspaper postage. I would recommend that the friends in each place should estimate the number wanted, collect the money and send it in convenient sums by mail. Address M. A. Chappell, Pittsburgh. Price 25 cents for single copy—\$2 per dozen, \$15.00 per hundred. D.

#### WESTERN UNIVERSITY OF PENNA.

We have been favored by the politeness of Mr Eaton, the principal, with a catalogue of the Trustees, Teachers and Scholars of the English Department of this Institution, from which, it appears that the school is in a very flourishing condition. It contains the names of one hundred and ten scholars, for the term ending Mar. 31, 1838.

From our little knowledge of the discipline and course of instruction in this school—the library, which is free to the scholars, the spaciousness of the rooms and competency of the principal, we hesitate not, to recommend this department of the institution to the attention of parents and guardians, who may wish their children properly and thoroughly educated in the several English branches.

#### THE CAUSE IN PITTSBURGH.

It is a long time since we have said anything of the prospects in this city—we have waited in hopes that we might speak better things, but fearing we shall have to wait too long before we can say what we could wish, we venture to say a few words now. This week commences the third year of our ministerial labours in this city—two years ago our church was unfinished, and entirely unfit to meet in. It is now finished, and is neat and convenient for three or four hundred persons. Our Society then consisted of sixteen members—now of eighty. The congregations have increased nearly in the same proportion and the zeal and love for the cause, in a far greater. But we yet labor under many and great disadvantages. Our church is twice too small—the depression of business of all kinds has curtailed our means, and doubtless, prevented in a great measure our farther increase of members. Dark clouds and bright sunshine have been alternately over us. We have been persecuted, perplexed, and troubled—but neither cast down or forsaken. On the whole, we feel to thank God and take courage. An increasing zeal has been manifested of late and we trust the Lord is for us, and if so, who can be against us?

Our opposers have watched us with a jealous eye, and their present alarm and outpouring of bitterness, shows that they fear for the safety of the goddess Diana. But we have learned not to be alarmed at their reproach—we shall move on our way rejoicing. D.

#### AN OFFER.

New subscribers, who shall send \$1.00 in advance, shall be credited for the last half of the present volume, and the whole of the third vol. of the Glad Tidings.

N. B. Having about fifty perfect files of the present volume, and being in want of money at the present time, we hereby offer to furnish them to new subscribers for \$1.00 each, as the time is so short before we shall commence the weekly paper. Agents who will send \$5. free of all expense, shall be entitled to six perfect sets of vol. 2. Will the friends to the cause think of this offer?

#### THE OFFICE OF THE GLAD TIDINGS

Is removed to Smithfield street, next door to the Universalist Church between Diamond Alley & Fifth street.

#### SINGLE SUBSCRIBERS.

We send single papers to one hundred and seventy-five different towns. Is it not possible that each one of these subscribers could obtain and send the money for a new one? We verily believe they might easily do it, and doubtless some might obtain two or three!

#### AGENCY.

Br Hiram Torrey is about to start on a tour through the Western Reserve, obtaining new subscribers to this paper and collecting money on old ones. As he goes, he will preach the everlasting gospel to the destitute. Br Torrey is affectionately recommended to the kind attention of all the friends wherever he may travel—I trust they will find him worthy. D.



'*Recompense at the resurrection of the just*.'—Luke 14: 14, is sometimes quoted by Limitarians to prove that mankind will receive the reward for their good deeds in the *general* resurrection. If our Lord referred to such an event, why did he *limit* and *qualify* his speech to signify a *partial*, instead of universal resurrection from the dead, by the term "*just*?" This should lead us to enquire *where* the resurrection alluded to was to take place, and concerning its nature. Note. The recompense and resurrection are *simultaneous*.—Then it follows by necessary induction, that both are in the same state. But where is the recompense? The answer is given by the wise man—"*The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth.*" Here is the recompense and consequently the resurrection, for they shall "*be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.*"—Hence, we perceive, the language must be referred to a moral resurrection, resulting from a belief in, and obedience to, the precepts of the gospel. The *just* shall live by faith; i. e., "*He that believeth hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from death unto life.*" Should it be objected, that it cannot refer to a resurrection from a state of moral death "*to newness of life,*" inasmuch as the subjects raised are called *just*, I would beg to leave with the objector this simple question; Are they raised up, *just*, or *unjust*? M. A. C.

#### AN ECDOTE.

A Methodist preacher in Ohio, noted rather for his pedantry than acquaintance with *Greek*, in a controversy with a Universalist layman, inquired, if he knew the meaning of the Greek word *aei*, to which he replied in the affirmative. Then you know, he continued, it is applied to the punishment of the wicked and signifies an *absolute eternity*. 'I think, Sir, you are mistaken,' rejoined the Universalist, for we read in the 8th chapter of Joshua, that he hanged the king of Ai on a tree. Could he thus execute the king of eternity? It is unnecessary to add, the priest was confounded. M. A. C.

*For the Glad Tidings.*

To the Rev. M. Harker, Springfield, Ohio.

No. 1.

REV. SIR,—The reason why I address you, and thus publicly, is the following: I was present at your meeting when you attempted to show the people that the confusion and disorder of your protracted meetings are sanctioned by God, and the plan or management which brings about this state of things, is the plan laid down by God himself. I address you, that you may know that your attempted deception was understood; and thus publicly, that others may not be deceived by such deceitful handling of the word of God. 2 Cor. 4: 2. The occasion of your bringing it up, you know, was during one evening of your last Quarterly Meeting in this place, when you were about inviting mourners forward to the altar, to be prayed for. You remarked that some were op-

posed to such measures, on account of the confusion, disorder, &c. 'But' said you, with much assurance, 'I will show you that it is God Almighty's plan as made known by St. Paul.' Well, how did you show it? By repeating the following passage in 1 Cor. 14: 23—25. I will quote as you did, that is, as nearly as I can remember. "If therefore the whole church become together in one place, (to hold a protracted meeting, as we have,) and all speak with tongues, (that is, all at the same time,) and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say ye are mad? (as some say of us.) But if all prophecy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, (convicted, as you are now in this meeting,) he is judged of all; (that is, he thinks all that is said is meant expressly for him;) And thus are the secrets of his heart manifest; and so, falling down on his face, (as mourners' do, who are convicted in our meeting,) he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." (as those we convert, say of ns.) This, I think, was the substance of your paraphrase. You then told us this was God's plan, made known by St. Paul. Br. Harker, did you intend to deceive the people, by this statement? verily, I must think that was the fact. For if you had studied the passage enough to make use of it, by perversion, to give countenance to your mode of procedure, you must have seen and known for what purpose the sacred writer mentioned it. If he referred to speaking in a confused manner, several at a time, did he not do it, only to *condemn* it? You must have noticed this, but kept it back from your congregation; having in view only your proselyting *management*. But let us look at his language in this connection. See verse 26: "*Let all things be done unto edifying.*" Now what edification is there, in eight or twelve men's talking at one time, and each saying different things? But read on, "*If any man speak in any unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret.*"—Now, Sir, in the face of this, will you say that Paul approved of the practice of all speaking *at once*? "For ye may all prophesy (how? all together? No, but) *one by one*, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." How much, think you, are those '*comforted*,' whom you frighten to your altar?—altar, on which your deuded victims sacrifice their peace and happiness. But he says they should speak '*one by one*,' yet you would attempt to make the people believe that he approved of all speaking at once! I pray you, beware! how you again pervert Paul's language in support of your proselyting schemes. But what else does Paul say? "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." Will you not heed this rebuke of the Apostle? You see by this, that the Holy Spirit '*is not* the

author of the confusion,' which reigns a times in your protracted meetings, as you would fain make the people believe and the fact of this confusion in your church when meeting together, proves it not to be a '*church of the saints.*' I think no one can fail of seeing that your use of Paul's language, was an entire perversion of it. With this conviction, I leave the matter. Your reference to the day of Pentecost, I may briefly consider in another letter. Hoping you may yet come to the knowledge of the truth, and be saved, I subscribe myself, Respectfully yours,

E. M. P.

Springfield, Clark co. O. March, 1833.

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this, the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. ix. 27, 28.

This text is most generally quoted as follows: 'It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment,' and, in this mutilated form, it is pressed into the support of the dogma of the general judgement day in eternity. On examination of the context, however, it will be seen that the apostle was contrasting the legal dispensation with that of the gospel, as evinced by the copulative '*as*,' in the text. Throughout the 9th chapter and beginning of the 10th, he argues the imperfection of the sacrifices and offerings under the law to make the comers thereunto perfect, and alleges that the services of the first covenant, with its first and second tabernacles, into which last the High Priest went alone once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and the errors of the people, (verse 7,) all of which was only prefigurative of the one great offering of Christ, the Great High Priest, who did not enter '*into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself,*' and for whom it was not necessary to '*offer himself often,*' as the High Priest (under the law) entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others, '*but now once in the end of the world,*' (age,) hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Then comes the text, which by the copulatives '*as*,' and '*so*,' clearly proves the comparison continued, to point out the difference between the figurative death offered by the Jewish High Priest, when clothed with the breast-plate of Judgment, and the actual death of Christ and his appearing a '*second time without sin unto salvation.*' See Exodus xxviii. 29, 40. But if it is still contended that this text has reference to the death of mankind generally, and a judgement after, it will not prove the doctrine of endless suffering, as Christ was to appear unto salvation and not unto damnation.—*Two Opinions.*

#### LETTERS & RECEIPTS.

Rev E B, Cherry Valley; P R, Columbus; P M, Brownsville; J H C, Philadelphia; L F, Mississippi; Rev I B, Springfield; A W B, Cincinnati; E R C, Elizabethtown—(good.)



"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them unto chains of darkness to be reserved unto Judgement." 2 Peter, ii: 4.

The word translated *hell*, in this text, is neither *gehenna* nor *hades*, but *tartaros*, and this is the only place where the word occurs. And admitting the *partialist's* view of the matter, we have nothing to do with it—as 'angels,' and not men, were to be the subjects of the punishment threatened.—*Two Opinions.*

### A Gentleman.

We perceive that several of our contemporaries are puzzling their wits and amusing their readers, to give the true definition of a "GENTLEMAN." Mr. Cilley, it seems, refused to hold intercourse with Col. Webb, because he (Col. W.) did not come up to *his* standard of the character alluded to; while Col. Webb, some time ago, refused to fight Mr. Leggett, the then editor of the New York Evening Post, and formerly a midshipman in the Navy, because *he*, in the estimation of the Colonel, was not a gentleman. A similar conclusion was arrived at by Col. Webb, in the case of Wood, the Vocalist. These various conclusions, the why and the wherefore not being fully explained, are somewhat puzzling to the uninitiated, and many are at a loss, in talking over the matter, to say *which* of the parties engaged, either directly or indirectly, in the recent duel, is the best entitled to the honorable distinction of '*gentleman*.' What—is now the question—is necessary to constitute a gentleman? WEALTH we all know does not, for if we cast our eyes around, and examine even the confined limits of Philadelphia, we shall find dozens who possess their thousands and ten of thousands—who, in short, are the Rothschilds of our city—but who, nevertheless, would be the last referred to, as models of *gentlemanly* bearing. OCCUPATION, however elevated or intellectual, cannot be said to constitute the gentleman; for even among professional men—men eminent for science and learning—professors, *savans*, and authors—numerous instances might be cited, in which the conduct and general character of the individuals alluded to, place them far beneath the pale of correct and lofty demeanour, and render them any thing but models of gentility. STATION cannot be said, in every instance, to embody the real character—the true impersonation; for even in the history of our own country, instances might be sighted, in which, if not the first office, at least the *second*, has been held by individuals, not gentlemen in the ordinary acceptance of the term—or, at least, certainly not, according to any exclusive code of analogy. It would seem, therefore, that neither worldly circumstances in relation to wealth—professional distinction, nor eminent station, are infallible, as tests of gentility. That each is found to fail, when cautiously scrutinized, and that although generally connected with the attributes of

a gentleman, many and glaring exceptions are apparent.

What then, we again ask—are the true characteristics of a gentleman? What, the infallible tests—what the inseparable attributes?

We forget Chesterfield's definition; but the only test we recognise, and, indeed, the only one that should, in our view, be recognized in any civilized country, is that of CONDUCT, BEHAVIOUR and ADDRESS. By *conduct*, we mean a man's actions through life, in society, and under the laws. This should be regulated by strict morality—morality as well of language as of action, as well of practice as of precept. No immoral man can, in our opinion of the subject, be a gentleman. A gentleman should possess a very fine sense of honor—not the honor of a duellist; but the magnanimous feeling which would prevent the infliction of a wrong upon another; or if such wrong upon another; or if such wrong had, in an unguarded moment, been committed—should induce a prompt, speedy, and generous atonement. The commission of a wrong, cannot, in this life, be at all times avoided—even by the most cautious. But the error and the crime consist in persisting and adhering to the wrong, after a full consciousness in our own bosom, that reparation was due. If we remember aright, it was Thales, the Milesian philosopher, who said that "next to the man who had never committed a wrong, should be praised, who was prompt and generous in atoning for his errors." A gentleman, moreover, should be above all meanness—all littleness of soul—and especially should he eschew falsehood, as he would avoid an adder.

By *behaviour*, we mean manners and deportment in society. A gentleman will, in his intercourse with his fellows, avoid all subjects to them unpleasant—all expressions calculated to wound their feelings—all topics conflicting with their prejudices—all eccentricity of manner—all vulgar epithets—and particularly all profanation and blasphemy. In short, he should remember that, as a component portion of civilized life, his object should be to please others, and thus gratify himself—and to add to the general good feeling and correct tone of social intercourse.

If to these qualifications, he likewise add a good *address*, and thus by unaffected manners, an easy and polite conversation, he make the outward man respond to the dictates of his mind, he would, whether born in a hovel or cradled in a palace, at least come up to our portrait of a—GENTLEMAN!

### NATIONAL FOUNDRY.

A bill has been reported in the Senate of the United States for the establishment of a National Foundry and a Western Armory.

The following are among provisions of section 1.

"For a national foundry, one hundred thousand dollars.

For an armory in the west twenty-five thousand dollars.

Sect. 2. "Sites for the aforesaid establishments shall be selected under the direction, and with the approbation of the President of the United States, and purchases of ground therefore when necessary, shall be paid for out of the appropriations for the same."

It is truly gratifying to learn, that the President of the United States is to be vested with power to make the locations and purchases for those great national works. There are few men in the union better acquainted with local advantages of this section of the state than the President. Under his direction, it is not to be doubted for a moment, but that the Manufacturing character of Pittsburgh, the Birmingham of America, will be duly appreciated, when he comes to decide on the relative claims of other advantageous point spoken of, for the sites of a national foundry and armory.

In this matter, we claim attention as affording every facility for the raw material, and with all the advantages of coal and extensive steam operations. Our proximity to the Lakes on the north and water communication with the Atlantic on the east and the Gulf of Mexico on the south, leave no room to question the superior claims of Pittsburgh as entitled to consideration. Indeed, any other point on the western waters would be dependant on this place for *supplies* to prosecute the works connected with a foundry or armory of any importance. The workmen are here,—the materials are here—and for this point there is no internal improvement and river communication to every section of the union. The location will of course be made in this vicinity.—*Dem. & Adv.*

### A GERMAN NOBLE OF THE 17th CENTURY.

The ruins of the enormous palace which Walstein inhabited in Prague, with its six gates, its vast halls, galleries and baths, are still in existence, vying in extent and magnificence, with those of the Roman Emperors, and corresponding to the extent of his revenue, which exceeded six millions of dollars. Besides his own properties in Bohemia and Moravia which he had acquired by his first marriage, he possessed the Duchies of Friedland and Mecklenburg the principalities of Sagan and Clogua, and immense sums in the banks of Amsterdam and Venice. He formed a court of his own, and kept a numerous body-guard, sixty pages, four chamberlains, twelve knights and barons, and three hundred horses, which were fed from marble mangers in his stable. His table was never furnished with less than a hundred covers, and his liveries, equipages, and furniture were in a corresponding style of regal splendor. Amidst the pomp with which he thus industriously surrounded himself, he was distinguished by the simplicity of his own tastes and habits, and his power of enduring labor and privations. Patient of hunger, thirst, and watchfulness, he never



himself indulged in the festivities of the table; to the other pleasures of the senses he was equally inaccessible—amusement he despised. Study, or exertion alone, could satisfy his brooding and restless mind. To noises of all kinds he had a particular aversion. Guards patrolled the avenues to his palace to prevent disturbance; the very sound of coaches was prohibited in its neighborhood, as he pursued his meditations on his future plans and prospects, conducted with his own hand his correspondence with every quarter in Europe, or devoted himself, in company with his astrologer, to the study of the planetary aspects, and endeavored to draw from them a confirmation of his hopes and fears as to his future destiny.

From the Richmond Whig.

### THE RAIL ROAD ACCIDENT.

There was an accident on the rail road, Saturday morning, which from the circumstances under which it happened, is particularly to be regretted. The train left Richmond as usual, soon after 4 o'clock in the morning, and had gone about 7 miles, when it encountered an obstruction upon the track, which threw the engine off the track. The obstruction was caused by a tree which being heavily laden with sleet had during the high wind of the night been blown down across the track. Mr. Joseph Anthony, the engine man, and Mr. Alpheus Mallory, the fireman, were both immediately thrown from the engine: The tender fell upon them, and both were killed. No passengers were at all hurt, nor was the baggage car even injured, which was between the tender and passenger car.

It frequently happens that accidents on rail roads are caused by want of care on the part of the engine man, and when such accidents happen, and the engine man is himself hurt in consequence of his own neglect, there is usually less sympathy for him on that account. But the present is not a case of that kind. On this occasion, there is every reason to believe, that the unfortunate men who have been killed, were free from that blame, and used such precautions as were in their power. The engine was not moving at any improper degree of speed—but day was just dawning and there was a general sleet, which at that hour disguised the object upon the track, and prevented its being seen at any distance. The condition in which the engine was found after the occurrence, showed, however, that the tree had been noticed, though at too late a moment to do any good. The break was found down, and the reverse motion of the engine in a position proper for stopping the train.

The King of Hanover has convoked the states of his kingdom for the 18th of February. The energetic manner in which public opinion has condemned his late acts,

and the strong censure passed on them by the legislatures of all the German confederacy, has somewhat cooled his adventurous spirit, and he is now about to return to his people a constitution nearly as liberal as the one he abrogated a few months since.

The result of the discussion our Chamber of Deputies on the question of intervention produced a feeling of stupor among the people of Madrid, we were not at all prepared for such a decision. Count Ofalia, who consented to accept the Presidency of the council, only on the positive assurance given him by the French Ambassador that his government would assist the Queen in men and money, could not, under those circumstances, continue much longer in office—the more so as the movement party had gained an important advantage in the election of Deputies and senators for the province of Madrid, and were again beginning to raise their heads. M. Villiers, the British Ambassador, determined on recovering the ground he has lost since the last ministerial reaction, has again pressed the Queen to commit the government to the hands of his protege General Cordova, whom he calls the "Napoleon of Spain." The poor Queen must be sadly perplexed; deceived on the one hand by France, inafficaciously aided on the other by England, she is unable to find a single man possessed of common honesty and ability to bring the country through its present difficulties.

CANAL BOATS.—During the week a number of canal boats have arrived in this place from the East.—*Dem. & Adv.*

### ORIGINAL.

Ye woods and wilds receive me to your shade;  
These still retreats our contemplation aid;  
From mortals flying to your chaste abode,  
Let us attend the instructive voice of God.  
He speaks in all, and is in all things found;  
We hear and perceive him all around;  
In nature's lovely and unblemished face,  
With joy his sacred lineaments we trace.  
O glorious Being! O supremely fair!  
How free, how perfect, thy productions are!  
Forgive us while with curious eyes we view,  
Thy works, and boldly thus thy steps pursue.  
The silent valley and the lonely grove  
We haunt, but Oh! tis thee we seek and love.  
'Tis not the chant of birds nor whispering breeze,  
But thy soft voice we seek among the trees;  
Invoking thee, by silver streams we walk;  
To thee in solitary shades we talk.  
We speak thy dear lov'd name, nor speak in vain,  
Kind echoes long the pleasing sound retain,  
Reviving sweets the opening flowers disclose;  
Fragrant the violet and the budding rose,  
But all their balmy sweets from thee they seal,  
And something of thee, to our souls reveal.  
Fair look the stars, and fair the morning ray,  
When first the fields their painted scenes display.  
Glorious the sun in his meridian height,  
And yet compared to thee, how faint the light.

Adored Artificer! what skill divine,  
What wonders in the whole—  
Beauty and life, and thou, the inspiring soul,  
Whatever grace or harmony's express'd  
On all thy works the God is there confessed.  
But oh! from all thy works how small apart,  
To human minds is known of what thou art;  
Fancy gives o'er its flight in search of thee;  
Our thoughts are lost in thy immortality.

Moundsville, Va.

J. F.

### QUEEN MARY IN PRISON.

"Far northward, on my own blue hills,  
How sweetly does the wild deer play  
Mid sparkling of a thousand rills,  
That rush o'er crag and cliff away;  
And sweet the waters' dash is heard,  
And pleasant is the hawk's horn's blarin',  
And wildly sings the forest bird  
Mid green hills, my northern home!

"And bright in many a sloping vale  
As the green lowlands spreading lie,  
Swept by the spring's refreshing gale,  
And cheered by spring's unclouded sky,  
And yet the queen of hill and vale,  
The heir of Scotland's crown and sway,  
Through prison bars must breathe the gale,  
Through prison bars behold the day.

"I would I were a highland maid,  
To dwell upon some bright lake's shore,  
One of those lakes like diamonds laid,  
Where many a dark cliff shades them o'er;  
Or a poor lowland girl, to stray  
Contented wid the peasant band,  
Rather than bear the fame of sway,  
A queen o'er a rebellious land.

"Now would I lay my crown aside,  
Give courtly pleasures to the wind,  
If I could seek some spot and hide  
Where all are low, but all are kind,  
And oh! for liberty! The spring  
That comes with joy comes not for me—  
Oh for yon lark's untiring wing,  
To mount the sky! I would be free!

"And 'twould be better e'en to die  
Than pine in prison thus alone,  
Forgotten in my misery  
By those I love. Ah! e'en my own  
Rebellious land! I love the still—  
Thy memory still can cheer my gloom!  
Linger on each far fading hill,  
And weep for thee, my northern home!"

She ceased—that royal fair—and in her eye  
Glitter'd a tear, as brilliantly as shine  
The stars on heaven's blue vault. Adown her  
neck  
In Scotland's wavy gold bright ringlets fell,  
Bright as the clouds around the setting sun.  
Musing, she sat within her prison room,  
And all her loneliness, and all her wrongs,  
Came darkly o'er her bosom, and she wept.  
Deserted Mary! If thou e'er didst stain  
Thy bosom with dark crimes, well didst thou pay  
When in thine own blood, ah, thy royal blood!  
Thine own bright locks were drench'd. Dark  
tyranny!  
Darkest in woman, who should ever be  
The merciful, the kind, the pitying friend,  
Even to the guilty!

### VIRTUE.

Of all the endowments of man, virtue is the most ennobling. It is the richest treasure men can possess, and the only one which can be equally distributed among them. It serves as a "leaven" to purify and cleanse from all iniquity, the heart of man, and will form the eternal purity of heaven.